arXiv:1304.3626v1 [math.PR] 12 Apr 2013

CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREMS FOR AN INDIAN BUFFET MODEL WITH RANDOM WEIGHTS

PATRIZIA BERTI, IRENE CRIMALDI, LUCA PRATELLI, AND PIETRO RIGO

Abstract. The three-parameter Indian buffet process is generalized. The possibly different role played by customers is taken into account by suitable (random) weights. Various limit theorems are also proved for such generalized Indian buffet process. Let L_n be the number of dishes experimented by the first n customers, and let $\overline{K}_n = (1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n K_i$ where K_i is the number of dishes tried by customer i. The asymptotic distributions of L_n and $\overline{K}_n$, suitably centered and scaled, are obtained. The convergence turns out to be stable (and not only in distribution). As a particular case, the results apply to the standard (i.e., non generalized) Indian buffet process.

1. Introduction

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ be a measurable space. Think of $\mathcal{X}$ as a collection of features potentially shared by an object. Such an object is assumed to have a finite number of features only and is identified with the features it possesses. To investigate the object, thus, we focus on the finite subsets of $\mathcal{X}$.

Each finite subset $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ can be associated to the measure $\mu_B = \sum_{x \in B} \delta_x$, where $\mu_\emptyset = 0$ and δ_x denotes the point mass at x. If B is random, μ_B is random as well. In fact, letting $F = \{\mu_B : B \text{ finite}\}$, there is a growing literature focusing on those random measures M satisfying $M \in F$ a.s.. (Measurability of the set $\{M \in F\}$ can be proved under mild assumptions on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$).

A remarkable example is the *Indian Buffet Process* (IBP) introduced by Griffiths and Ghahramani and developed by Thibaux and Jordan; see [13], [14], [23]. The objects are the customers which sequentially enter an infinite buffet $\mathcal{X}$ and the features are the dishes tasted by each customer. In this framework, each customer is modeled by a (completely) random measure M such that $M \in F$ a.s.. The atoms of M represent the dishes experimented by the customer.

Our starting point is a three-parameter extension of IBP, introduced in [7] and [22] to obtain power-law behavior. From now on, such an extension is referred to as the *standard* IBP. The dynamics is as follows. Let α, β and c be real numbers such that $\alpha > 0$, $0 \le \beta < 1$ and $c > -\beta$. Customer 1 tries Poi(α) dishes. For each $n \ge 1$, let S_n denote the collection of dishes experimented by the first n customers. Then:

- Customer $n+1$ selects a subset $S_n^* \subset S_n$. Each $x \in S_n$ is included or not into S_n^* independently of the other members of S_n. The inclusion probability

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60B10, 60F05, 60G09, 60G57, 62F15.

Key words and phrases. Bayesian nonparametrics, Central limit theorem, Conditional identity in distribution, Indian buffet process, Random measure, Random reinforcement, Stable convergence.

is $\frac{m(n,x)-\beta}{c+n}$ where $m(n,x)$ is the number of previous customers who tried dish x.

- In addition to S_n^*, customer $n+1$ also tries $\text{Poi}(\alpha_{n+1})$ new dishes, where $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha \frac{\Gamma(c+1)\Gamma(c+\beta+n)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)\Gamma(c+1+n)}$.

For $\beta = 0$, such a model reduces to the original IBP of [13], [14], [23].

IBP is a flexible tool, able to capture the dynamics of various real problems. Applications of IBP range from Bayesian nonparametrics [16] and causal inference [25] to modeling of choices [12], similarity judgements [20] and dyadic data [18].

Despite its prominent role, however, the asymptotics of IBP is largely neglected. To the best of our knowledge, the only known fact is the a.s. behavior of L_n (defined below) and some other related quantities for large n; see [7] and [22]. Nothing is known as regards limiting distributions.

This paper aims to do two things.

First, to generalize the standard IBP in order to account for the different importance of customers. To this end, customer n is attached a random weight R_n. For each $x \in S_n$, the inclusion probability becomes $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i M_i\{x\}-\beta}{c+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i}$ where $M_i\{x\}$ is the indicator of the event {customer i selects dish x}. If $R_n = 1$ for all n, the model reduces to the standard IBP. See [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [21] for analogous models in different settings, and [10], [11], [19], [24] for other IBP-type models.

Second, to investigate the asymptotics of the previous generalized IBP model. We focus on

$$L_n = \text{number of dishes experimented by the first } n \text{ customers, and}$$

$$\overline{K}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K_i \text{ where } K_i = \text{number of dishes tried by customer } i.$$

Three results are obtained. Define $a_n(\beta) = \log n$ if $\beta = 0$ and $a_n(\beta) = n^\beta$ if $\beta \in (0,1)$. Then, under reasonable conditions on the weights R_n, it is shown that:

(i) $\frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda$, where λ is a certain constant depending on α, β and c;

(ii) $\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}\left\{\frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} - \lambda\right\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,\, \lambda)$ stably;

(iii) $\overline{K}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ and $\sqrt{n}\left\{\overline{K}_n - Z\right\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,\, \sigma^2)$ stably, where Z and σ^2 are suitable *random* variables.

Stable convergence is a strong form of convergence in distribution. The basic definition is recalled in Subsection 2.3.

Among other things, the above results can be useful to make (asymptotic) inference on the model. As an example, (i) implies that

$$\widehat{\beta}_n = \frac{\log L_n}{\log n}$$

is a strongly consistent estimator of the parameter β. In turn, (ii) provides the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\beta}_n$ so that simple tests on β can be manufactured. Similarly, (iii) can be exploited to get asymptotic confidence bounds for the random limit Z of $\overline{K}_n$; see Subsection 5.1.

A last remark is that (i)-(ii)-(iii) hold in particular when $R_n = 1$ for all n. Thus, (ii) and (iii) provide the limiting distributions of L_n and $\overline{K}_n$ in the standard IBP model.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Basic notation.** Throughout, $\mathcal{X}$ is a separable metric space and $\mathcal{B}$ the Borel σ-field on $\mathcal{X}$. We let

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\mu : \mu \text{ is a finite positive measure on } \mathcal{B}\}$$

and we say that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ is *diffuse* in case $\mu\{x\} = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

All random variables appearing in this paper, unless otherwise stated, are defined on a fixed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$. If $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a sub-σ-field and X and Y are random variables with values in the same measurable space, we write

$$X \mid \mathcal{G} \sim Y \mid \mathcal{G}$$

to mean that $P(X \in A \mid \mathcal{G}) = P(Y \in A \mid \mathcal{G})$ a.s. for each measurable set A.

Finally, $\mathrm{Poi}(\lambda)$ is the Poisson distribution with mean λ and $\mathcal{N}(0, \lambda)$ the Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance λ. Here, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mathrm{Poi}(0) = \mathcal{N}(0, 0) = \delta_0$.

2.2. **Random measures.** A *random measure* (r.m.) is a map $M : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$ such that $\omega \mapsto M(\omega)(B)$ is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$. In the sequel, we write $M(B)$ to denote the real random variable $\omega \mapsto M(\omega)(B)$. Similarly, if $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded measurable function, $M(f)$ stands for

$$M(\omega)(f) = \int f(x)\, M(\omega)(dx).$$

A *completely* r.m. is a r.m. M such that $M(B_1), \ldots, M(B_k)$ are independent random variables whenever $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}$ are pairwise disjoint.

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$. A *Poisson r.m. with intensity* ν is a completely r.m. M such that $M(B) \sim \mathrm{Poi}\big(\nu(B)\big)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Note that $M(B) = 0$ a.s. in case $\nu(B) = 0$. Note also that the intensity ν has been requested to be a finite measure (and not a σ-finite measure as it usually happens).

We refer to chapter VI of [8] for Poisson r.m.'s. We just note that a Poisson r.m. with intensity ν is easily obtained. It suffices to let $M = 0$ if $\nu(\mathcal{X}) = 0$, and otherwise

$$M = I_{\{N>0\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta_{X_j},$$

where (X_j) is an i.i.d. sequence of $\mathcal{X}$-valued random variables with $X_1 \sim \nu/\nu(\mathcal{X})$, N is independent of (X_j) and $N \sim \mathrm{Poi}\big(\nu(\mathcal{X})\big)$.

As explained in Section 1, in this paper we focus on those r.m.'s M satisfying $M \in F$ a.s., where $F = \{\mu_B : B \text{ finite}\}$ and $\mu_B = \sum_{x \in B} \delta_x$. If M is a Poisson r.m. with intensity ν, then $M \in F$ a.s. if and only if ν is diffuse. Therefore, another class of r.m.'s is to be introduced.

Each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ can be uniquely written as $\nu = \nu_c + \nu_d$, where ν_c is diffuse and

$$\nu_d = \sum_j \gamma_j\, \delta_{x_j}$$

for some $\gamma_j \geq 0$ and $x_j \in \mathcal{X}$. (The case $\nu_d = 0$ corresponds to $\gamma_j = 0$ for all j). Say that M is a *Bernoulli r.m. with hazard measure* ν, where $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, if

- $M = M_1 + M_2$ with M_1 and M_2 independent r.m.'s;
- M_1 is a Poisson r.m. with intensity ν_c;
- $M_2 = \sum_j V_j \, \delta_{x_j}$ where the V_j are independent indicators satisfying $P(V_j = 1) = \gamma_j$.

Some (obvious) consequences of the definition are the following.

- $M = M_1$ a.s. if $\nu = \nu_c$ and $M = M_2$ a.s. if $\nu = \nu_d$;
- M is a completely r.m.;
- $M \in F$ a.s..

We will write

$$M \sim BeP(\nu)$$

to mean that M is a Bernoulli r.m. with hazard measure ν.

2.3. **Stable convergence.** Stable convergence is a strong form of convergence in distribution. We just recall the basic definition and we refer to [9], [15] and references therein for more information.

A r.m. K such that $K(\omega)(\mathcal{X}) = 1$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, is said to be a *kernel* or a *random probability measure*. Let K be a kernel and (X_n) a sequence of $\mathcal{X}$-valued random variables. Say that X_n *converges stably to* K if

$$E\big\{K(f) \mid H\big\} = \lim_n E\big\{f(X_n) \mid H\big\}$$

for all $H \in \mathcal{A}$ with $P(H) > 0$ and all bounded continuous $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$. (Recall that $\mathcal{A}$ denotes the basic σ-field on Ω). For $H = \Omega$, stable convergence trivially implies convergence in distribution.

3. THE MODEL

Let $(M_n : n \geq 1)$ be a sequence of r.m.'s and $(R_n : n \geq 1)$ a sequence of real random variables. The probability distribution of $((M_n, R_n) : n \geq 1)$ is identified by the parameters m, α, β and c as follows.

- m is a diffuse probability measure on $\mathcal{B}$;
- α, β, c are real numbers such that $\alpha > 0$, $\beta < 1$ and $c > -\beta$;
- $R_n \geq u > \beta^+$, for some constant u, and R_n independent of $(M_1, \ldots, M_n, R_1, \ldots, R_{n-1})$ for each $n \geq 1$;
- $M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \sim BeP(\nu_n)$ for all $n \geq 0$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}, \quad \nu_0 = \alpha\, m, \quad \mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(M_1, \ldots, M_n, R_1, \ldots, R_n),$$

$$\nu_n = \sum_{x \in S_n} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i M_i\{x\} - \beta}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c}\, \delta_x + \frac{\Gamma(c+1)\Gamma(c+\beta+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)\Gamma(c+1+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i)}\, \alpha\, m$$

$$\text{and} \quad S_n = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : M_i\{x\} = 1 \text{ for some } i = 1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Our model is the sequence $((M_n, R_n) : n \geq 1)$. It reduces to the standard IBP in case $R_n = 1$ for all n and $\beta \in [0, 1)$. Note that M_1 is a Poisson r.m. with intensity $\alpha\, m$. Note also that $M_n \in F$ a.s. for all $n \geq 1$, so that

$$S_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{Support}(M_i) \quad \text{a.s..}$$

As remarked in Section 1, R_n should be regarded as the weight of customer n. Thus, the possibly different role played by each customer can be taken into account.

Instead, m, α, β and c have essentially the same meaning as in the standard IBP model (apart from β may be negative). Precisely, α is a mass parameter controlling the total number of tried dishes, c is a concentration parameter controlling the number of customers which try each dish, and β is a stability exponent tuning the power-law behavior of the process (as far as $\beta \geq 0$). The probability measure m allows to draw, at each step $n \geq 1$, an i.i.d. sample of new dishes. In fact, $m\big(\mathcal{X} \setminus S_n\big) = 1$ a.s. for m is diffuse and S_n finite a.s..

A r.m. can be seen as a random variable with values in $(\mathcal{M}, \Sigma)$, where Σ is the σ-field on $\mathcal{M}$ generated by the maps $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. In the standard IBP case, (M_n) is an exchangeable sequence of random variables. Now, because of the R_n, exchangeability is generally lost. In fact, the same phenomenon (loss of exchangeability) occurs in various other extensions of IBP; see [10], [11], [19], [24]. However, for $\beta = 0$, (M_n) is *conditionally identically distributed* (c.i.d.) with respect to the filtration

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}, \quad \mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{F}_n \vee \sigma(R_{n+1}) = \sigma(M_1, \ldots, M_n, R_1, \ldots, R_n, R_{n+1}).$$

This means that

$$M_k \mid \mathcal{G}_n \sim M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n \quad \text{for all } k > n \geq 0.$$

Among other things, $M_k \sim M_1$ for all $k \geq 1$ whenever (M_n) is c.i.d..

C.i.d. sequences need not be exchangeable, but their asymptotic behavior is rather close to that of exchangeable ones. We refer to [4] for more on c.i.d. sequences. Here, we make the conditions for (M_n) to be c.i.d. precise. Define

$$\Lambda_0 = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_n = \alpha \, \frac{\Gamma(c+1)\Gamma(c+\beta+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)\Gamma(c+1+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i)}.$$

Lemma 1. *(M_n) is c.i.d. with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_n)$ if and only if*

$$\Lambda_{n+1} = \Lambda_n \Big(1 - \frac{R_{n+1} - \beta}{c + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i}\Big) \quad \textit{a.s..} \tag{1}$$

Proof. We just give a sketch of the proof. First note that, since R_{n+1} is independent of $(M_1, \ldots, M_n, M_{n+1}, R_1, \ldots, R_n)$, then

$$P\big(M_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big) = P\big(M_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big) \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Further, (M_n) is c.i.d. with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_n)$ if and only if

$$M_{n+2}(B) \mid \mathcal{G}_n \sim M_{n+1}(B) \mid \mathcal{G}_n \quad \text{for each } n \geq 0 \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{2}$$

In fact, conditionally on $\mathcal{G}_n$, the r.m.'s M_{n+1} and M_{n+2} are both *completely* r.m.'s (we omit the proof of this fact). Hence, condition (2) amounts to

$$M_{n+2} \mid \mathcal{G}_n \sim M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

Such condition is equivalent to $M_k \mid \mathcal{G}_n \sim M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n$ for all $k > n \geq 0$, as it can be shown by a simple induction on k.

We next prove that (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2). Fix $n \geq 0$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. It can be assumed $m(B) > 0$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} E\big\{e^{t\, M_{n+1}(B)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} &= E\big\{e^{t\, M_{n+1}(B)} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big\} \\ = \exp\big(m(B)\,(e^t - 1)\,\Lambda_n\big) &\prod_{x \in S_n \cap B} \Big\{1 + (e^t - 1)\,\frac{-\beta + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i M_i\{x\}}{c + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i}\Big\} \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is because $M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \sim BeP(\nu_n)$. Similarly,

$$E\big\{e^{t\,M_{n+2}(B)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} = E\big\{E\big(e^{t\,M_{n+2}(B)} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n+1}\big) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\}$$

$$= \exp\big(m(B)\,(e^t-1)\,\Lambda_{n+1}\big)\,E\Big\{\prod_{x\in S_{n+1}\cap B}\Big(1+(e^t-1)\,\frac{-\beta+\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}R_iM_i\{x\}}{c+\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}R_i}\Big) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\Big\} \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Finally, it can be shown that

$$E\Big\{\prod_{x\in S_{n+1}\cap B}\Big(1+(e^t-1)\,\frac{-\beta+\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}R_iM_i\{x\}}{c+\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}R_i}\Big) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\Big\} =$$

$$= \exp\Big(m(B)\,(e^t-1)\,\Lambda_n\,\frac{R_{n+1}-\beta}{c+\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}R_i}\Big)\prod_{x\in S_n\cap B}\Big\{1+(e^t-1)\,\frac{-\beta+\sum_{i=1}^{n}R_iM_i\{x\}}{c+\sum_{i=1}^{n}R_i}\Big\} \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Again, we omit the calculations for this last equality. Therefore, condition (1) amounts to $E\big\{e^{t\,M_{n+2}(B)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} = E\big\{e^{t\,M_{n+1}(B)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\}$ a.s. for each $t\in\mathbb{R}$. □

It is straightforward to verify that condition (1) holds if $\beta = 0$ or if $R_n = 1$ for all n.

4. Asymptotic behavior of L_n

Let N_i be the number of new dishes tried by customer i, i.e.,

$$N_i = \operatorname{card}(S_i \setminus S_{i-1}) \quad \text{with} \quad S_0 = \emptyset.$$

Note that N_i is $\mathcal{F}_i$-measurable and $N_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \sim \operatorname{Poi}(\Lambda_{i-1})$.

This section is devoted to

$$L_n = \operatorname{card}(S_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n N_i,$$

the number of dishes experimented by the first n customers. Our main tool is the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2. *There is a function $h : [c,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\sup_{x\ge c}|x\,h(x)| < \infty \quad \textit{and} \quad \Lambda_n = \alpha\,\frac{\Gamma(c+1)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)}\,\frac{1+h\big(c+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i\big)}{\big(c+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i\big)^{1-\beta}} \quad \textit{for all } n\ge 1.$$

In particular,

$$\Lambda_n \le \frac{const}{n^{1-\beta}} \quad \textit{and} \quad \big|\Lambda_{n+1}-\Lambda_n\big| \le \frac{const}{n^{2-\beta}} \quad \textit{for all } n\ge 1,$$

where "const" denotes a suitable (non random) constant.

Proof. Just note that $\frac{\Gamma(x+\beta)}{\Gamma(x+1)} = x^{\beta-1}(1+h(x))$, with h as required, for all $x\ge c$; see e.g. formula (6.1.47) of [1]. Further, $(c+\sum_{i=1}^n R_i)^{-1} \le (u\,n)^{-1}$ for all $n\ge 1$, since $R_i \ge u > 0$ for all i. □

A first consequence of Lemma 2 is that, for $\beta < 0$, customers eventually stop to experiment new dishes.

Lemma 3. $P\big(N_i > \frac{1}{1-\beta}$ *infinitely often*$\big) = 0$. *In particular,*

$$P\big(N_i > 0 \textit{ infinitely often}\big) = 0 \quad \textit{if } \beta < 0.$$

Proof. Fix an integer $k \geq 1$. Since $N_{i+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_i \sim \text{Poi}(\Lambda_i)$,

$$P(N_{i+1} \geq k) = E\big\{P(N_{i+1} \geq k \mid \mathcal{F}_i)\big\} = E\Big\{e^{-\Lambda_i} \sum_{j \geq k} \frac{\Lambda_i^j}{j!}\Big\} \leq \frac{E(\Lambda_i^k)}{k!}.$$

By Lemma 2, $E(\Lambda_i^k) = \text{O}(i^{-(1-\beta)k})$. Letting $k = 1 + [1/(1-\beta)]$, since $k\,(1-\beta) > 1$, one obtains $\sum_i P\big(N_i > 1/(1-\beta)\big) = \sum_i P(N_i \geq k) < \infty$. □

If $\beta < 0$, Lemma 3 yields $L_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i < \infty$. If $\beta \in [0,1)$, the a.s. behavior of L_n for large n can be determined by a simple martingale argument. Define

$$\overline{R}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i$$

and suppose that

$$\overline{R}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} r \quad \text{for some constant } r. \tag{3}$$

Since $R_i \geq u$ for all i, then $r \geq u > 0$. Define also

$$\lambda(\beta) = \frac{\alpha\, c}{r} \text{ if } \beta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(\beta) = \frac{\alpha\, \Gamma(c+1)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)} \frac{1}{\beta\, r^{1-\beta}} \text{ if } \beta \in (0,1),$$

$$a_n(\beta) = \log n \text{ if } \beta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_n(\beta) = n^{\beta} \text{ if } \beta \in (0,1).$$

Theorem 4. *If $\beta \in [0,1)$ and condition (3) holds, then*

$$\frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda(\beta).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2, $\Lambda_j = \alpha \frac{\Gamma(c+1)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)} \big(c + \sum_{i=1}^{j} R_i\big)^{\beta-1} \big\{1 + h\big(c + \sum_{i=1}^{j} R_i\big)\big\}$ where the function h satisfies $|h(x)| \leq (k/x)$ for all $x \geq c$ and some constant k. Write

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda_j}{a_n(\beta)} = \alpha \frac{\Gamma(c+1)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j^{\beta-1} \big(\frac{c}{j} + \overline{R}_j\big)^{\beta-1}}{a_n(\beta)} + D_n,$$

$$\text{where } \; D_n = \alpha \frac{\Gamma(c+1)}{\Gamma(c+\beta)} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \big(c + \sum_{i=1}^{j} R_i\big)^{\beta-1} h\big(c + \sum_{i=1}^{j} R_i\big)}{a_n(\beta)}.$$

In view of (3), one easily obtains $D_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ and $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda_j}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda(\beta)$. Next, define

$$T_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad T_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{N_j - E(N_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1})}{a_j(\beta)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{N_j - \Lambda_{j-1}}{a_j(\beta)}.$$

Then, (T_n) is a martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ and

$$E(T_n^2) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{E\big\{(N_j - \Lambda_{j-1})^2\big\}}{a_j(\beta)^2} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{E\big\{E\big((N_j - \Lambda_{j-1})^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}\big)\big\}}{a_j(\beta)^2} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{E(\Lambda_{j-1})}{a_j(\beta)^2}.$$

Since $E(\Lambda_j) = \text{O}(j^{-(1-\beta)})$, then $\sup_n E(T_n^2) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(\Lambda_{j-1})}{a_j(\beta)^2} < \infty$. Thus, T_n converges a.s., and Kronecker lemma implies

$$\lim_n \frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} = \lim_n \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} N_j}{a_n(\beta)} = \lim_n \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \Lambda_{j-1}}{a_n(\beta)} = \lim_n \frac{\Lambda_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda_j}{a_n(\beta)} = \lambda(\beta) \quad \text{a.s.}.$$

□

Theorem 4 essentially states that, as far as the weights R_n meet the SLLN, L_n behaves for large n as in the standard IBP model. Note also that, the R_n being independent, a sufficient condition for (3) is

$$\sup_n E(R_n^2) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E(R_i)}{n} \longrightarrow r.$$

We next turn to the limiting distribution of L_n. To get something, stronger conditions on the R_n are to be requested.

Theorem 5. *Let $\beta \in [0,1)$. If*

$$\overline{R}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} r \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n j^{\beta-1}\, E\Big|\overline{R}_j - r\Big|}{\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{4}$$

for some constant r, then

$$\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}\,\Big\{\frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} - \lambda(\beta)\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0,\, \lambda(\beta)\big) \quad \textit{stably.}$$

Proof. We first prove that

$$\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}\,\Big\{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda_{j-1}}{a_n(\beta)} - \lambda(\beta)\Big\} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \tag{5}$$

Let $\beta = 0$. Then, by Lemma 2, condition (5) is equivalent to

$$Y_n := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \big\{\frac{1}{c+\sum_{i=1}^j R_i} - \frac{1}{r\,j}\big\}}{\sqrt{\log n}} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Since $c + \sum_{i=1}^j R_i > \sum_{i=1}^j R_i \geq j\,u$, then

$$E\Big|\frac{1}{c+\sum_{i=1}^j R_i} - \frac{1}{r\,j}\Big| \leq \frac{E\Big|c + \sum_{i=1}^j R_i - r\,j\Big|}{u\,r\,j^2} \leq \frac{c}{u\,r\,j^2} + \frac{E\Big|\overline{R}_j - r\Big|}{u\,r\,j}.$$

Hence, condition (4) implies $E|Y_n| \to 0$. This proves (5) for $\beta = 0$. The case $\beta \in (0,1)$ can be handled in exactly the same way. Thus, condition (5) holds.

Next, define

$$U_n = \sqrt{a_n(\beta)}\,\Big\{\frac{L_n}{a_n(\beta)} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda_{j-1}}{a_n(\beta)}\Big\} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n (N_j - \Lambda_{j-1})}{\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}}.$$

In view of (5), it suffices to show that $U_n \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0,\, \lambda(\beta)\big)$ stably. To this end, for $n \geq 1$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$, define

$$U_{n,j} = \frac{N_j - \Lambda_{j-1}}{\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{n,0} = \mathcal{F}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{n,j} = \mathcal{F}_j.$$

Then, $E\big(U_{n,j} \mid \mathcal{R}_{n,j-1}\big) = 0$ a.s., $\mathcal{R}_{n,j} \subset \mathcal{R}_{n+1,j}$ and $U_n = \sum_j U_{n,j}$. Thus, by the martingale CLT, $U_n \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0,\, \lambda(\beta)\big)$ stably provided

$$\text{(i)}\ \sum_{j=1}^n U_{n,j}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \lambda(\beta), \quad \text{(ii)}\ \max_{1\leq j\leq n} |U_{n,j}| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{(iii)}\ \sup_n E\big\{\max_{1\leq j\leq n} U_{n,j}^2\big\} < \infty;$$

see e.g. Theorem 3.2, page 58, of [15]. Let

$$H_j = (N_j - \Lambda_{j-1})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad D_n = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \big\{H_j - E(H_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1})\big\}}{a_n(\beta)}.$$

By Kronecker lemma and the same martingale argument used in the proof of Theorem 4, $D_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. Since $\overline{R}_j \xrightarrow{a.s.} r$ and $E(H_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \Lambda_{j-1}$ a.s., then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n U_{n,j}^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n H_j}{a_n(\beta)} = D_n + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda_{j-1}}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda(\beta).$$

This proves condition (i). As to (ii), fix $k \geq 1$ and note that

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n} U_{n,j}^2 \leq \frac{\max_{1\leq j\leq k} H_j}{a_n(\beta)} + \max_{k<j\leq n} \frac{H_j}{a_j(\beta)} \leq \frac{\max_{1\leq j\leq k} H_j}{a_n(\beta)} + \sup_{j>k} \frac{H_j}{a_j(\beta)} \quad \text{for } n > k.$$

Hence, $\limsup_n \max_{1\leq j\leq n} U_{n,j}^2 \leq \limsup_n \frac{H_n}{a_n(\beta)}$ and condition (ii) follows from

$$\frac{H_n}{a_n(\beta)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n H_j}{a_n(\beta)} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} H_j}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Finally, condition (iii) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2 and

$$E\big\{\max_{1\leq j\leq n} U_{n,j}^2\big\} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n E(H_j)}{a_n(\beta)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n E(\Lambda_{j-1})}{a_n(\beta)}.$$

□

Again, using that (R_n) is an independent sequence, it is not hard to show that condition (4) is satisfied provided

$$\sup_n E(R_n^2) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n^\beta \log n}\,\big\{E(\overline{R}_n) - r\big\} \longrightarrow 0.$$

In particular, (4) holds in case $\sup_n E(R_n^2) < \infty$ and $E(R_n) = r$ for all n. Note also that, letting $R_n = 1$ for all n, Theorem 5 provides the limiting distribution of L_n in the standard IBP model.

A last remark is in order. Fix a set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and define

$$L_n(B) = \operatorname{card}(B \cap S_n)$$

to be the number of dishes, belonging to B, tried by the first n customers. The same arguments used for $L_n = L_n(\mathcal{X})$ apply to $L_n(B)$ and allow to extend Theorems 4-5 as follows.

Theorem 6. *Let $\beta \in [0,1)$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. If condition (3) holds, then*

$$\frac{L_n(B)}{a_n(\beta)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} m(B)\lambda(\beta).$$

Moreover, under condition (4), one obtains

$$\sqrt{a_n(\beta)}\,\Big\{\frac{L_n(B)}{a_n(\beta)} - m(B)\lambda(\beta)\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0,\, m(B)\lambda(\beta)\big) \quad \textit{stably.}$$

Proof. Let $N_i(B)$ denote the number of new dishes, belonging to B, tried by customer i. Then, $L_n(B) = \sum_{i=1}^n N_i(B)$ and $N_{i+1}(B) \mid \mathcal{F}_i \sim \operatorname{Poi}(m(B)\,\Lambda_i)$. Therefore, it suffices to repeat the proofs of Theorems 4-5 with $N_i(B)$ in the place of N_i and $m(B)\,\Lambda_i$ in the place of Λ_i. □

5. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF $\overline{K}_n$

5.1. The result.

Let $K_i = M_i(\mathcal{X})$ be the number of dishes experimented by customer i and

$$\overline{K}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K_i$$

the mean number of dishes tried by each of the first n customers. In IBP-type models, $\overline{K}_n$ is a meaningful quantity and one (natural) question concerns its limiting distribution. Such question is answered by the next result.

Theorem 7. *Suppose $\beta \in [0,\,1/2)$ and*

$$\sup_n R_n \le b, \quad E(R_n) \longrightarrow r, \quad E(R_n^2) \longrightarrow q,$$

for some constants b, r, q. Then,

$$\overline{K}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K_i^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q$$

for some real random variables Z and Q such that $Z^2 < Q$ a.s.. Moreover,

$$\sqrt{n}\,\bigl\{\overline{K}_n - Z\bigr\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\bigl(0,\,\sigma^2\bigr) \quad \text{stably, where} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{2q-r^2}{r^2}\,(Q-Z^2).$$

Theorem 7 is a consequence of Theorem 1 of [6]. The proof, even if conceptually simple, is technically rather hard.

Theorem 7 fails, as it stands, for $\beta \in [1/2,\,1)$. As an example, $\sqrt{n}\,\bigl\{\overline{K}_n - Z\bigr\}$ does not converge in distribution for $\beta \in (1/2,\,1)$, even if $R_n = r$ for all n and some constant $r \neq 1$.

It is worth noting that, since $q \ge r^2$ and $Q > Z^2$ a.s., the (random) variance σ^2 of the limit kernel satisfies $\sigma^2 > 0$ a.s..

Among other things, Theorem 7 can be useful to get asymptotic confidence bounds for Z. Define in fact

$$\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 = \Bigl\{\frac{(2/n)\sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2}{\overline{R}_n^2} - 1\Bigr\}\Bigl\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K_i^2 - \overline{K}_n^2\Bigr\}.$$

Since $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sigma^2$ and $\sigma^2 > 0$ a.s., one obtains

$$I_{\{\widehat{\sigma}_n > 0\}}\frac{\sqrt{n}\,\bigl\{\overline{K}_n - Z\bigr\}}{\widehat{\sigma}_n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,\,1) \quad \text{stably.}$$

Thus, $\overline{K}_n \pm \frac{u_\alpha}{\sqrt{n}}\,\widehat{\sigma}_n$ provides an asymptotic confidence interval for Z with (approximate) level $1-\alpha$, where u_α is such that $\mathcal{N}(0,1)(u_\alpha,\,\infty) = \alpha/2$.

Letting $R_n = 1$ for all n, Theorem 7 applies to the standard IBP model. In this particular case, moreover, Theorem 7 holds for every $\beta \in [0,1)$. In fact, the assumption $\beta < 1/2$ is only needed in checking condition (j) (see the proof below). But, in view of Lemma 1, if $R_n = 1$ for all n then (M_n) is c.i.d. with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)$. Thus, (M_n) is c.i.d. with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ as well, and condition (j) (with $\mathcal{U}_n = \mathcal{F}_n$) is automatically true.

5.2. **The proof.** We begin with a couple of results from [6]. Let (X_n) be a sequence of real integrable random variables, adapted to a filtration $(\mathcal{U}_n)$, and let

$$Z_n = E\big(X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{U}_n\big).$$

Lemma 8. *If* $\sum_n n^{-2}E(X_n^2) < \infty$ *and* $Z_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$, *for some real random variable* Z, *then*

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z \quad \text{and} \quad n\sum_{k\geq n}\frac{X_k}{k^2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z.$$

Proof. This is exactly Lemma 2 of [6]. □

Theorem 9. *Suppose* (X_n^2) *is uniformly integrable and*

(j) $n^3 E\big\{\big(E(Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{U}_n) - Z_n\big)^2\big\} \longrightarrow 0.$

Then, $Z_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ *and* $(1/n)\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ *for some real random variable* Z. *Moreover,*

$$\sqrt{n}\,\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k - Z\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0,\, U+V\big) \quad \textit{stably}$$

for some real random variables U *and* V, *provided*

(jj) $E\big\{\sup_{k\geq 1}\sqrt{k}\,|Z_{k-1} - Z_k|\,\big\} < \infty,$

(jjj) $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\big\{X_k - Z_{k-1} + k(Z_{k-1} - Z_k)\big\}^2 \xrightarrow{P} U,$

(jv) $n\sum_{k\geq n}(Z_{k-1} - Z_k)^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} V.$

Proof. First note that (Z_n) is a quasi-martingale because of (j) and it is uniformly integrable for (X_n^2) is uniformly integrable. Hence, $Z_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$. By Lemma 8, one also obtains $(1/n)\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$. Next, assume conditions (jj)-(jjj)-(jv). By Theorem 1 of [6] (and the subsequent remarks) it is enough to show that

$$\sqrt{n}\,E\big\{\sup_{k\geq n}|Z_{k-1} - Z_k|\,\big\} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\,E\big\{\max_{1\leq k\leq n} k\,|Z_{k-1} - Z_k|\big\} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $D_k = |Z_{k-1} - Z_k|$. Because of (jv),

$$n\,D_n^2 = n\sum_{k\geq n} D_k^2 - \frac{n}{n+1}\,(n+1)\sum_{k\geq n+1} D_k^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Thus $\sup_{k\geq n}\sqrt{k}\,D_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, and condition (jj) implies

$$\sqrt{n}\,E\big\{\sup_{k\geq n} D_k\,\big\} \leq E\big\{\sup_{k\geq n}\sqrt{k}\,D_k\big\} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Further, for $1 \leq m < n$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} E\big\{\max_{1\leq k\leq n} k\,D_k\big\} &\leq E\big\{\max_{1\leq k\leq m} k\,D_k\big\} + \sqrt{n}\,E\big\{\max_{m<k\leq n}\sqrt{k}\,D_k\big\} \\ &\leq E\big\{\max_{1\leq k\leq m} k\,D_k\big\} + \sqrt{n}\,E\big\{\sup_{k>m}\sqrt{k}\,D_k\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to note that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\, E\big\{\max_{1\le k\le n} k\, D_k\big\} \le E\big\{\sup_{k>m} \sqrt{k}\, D_k\big\} \quad \text{for all } m,$$

and $\lim_m E\big\{\sup_{k>m} \sqrt{k}\, D_k\big\} = 0$. □

Note that condition (j) is automatically true in case (X_n) is c.i.d. with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{U}_n)$. We are now able to prove Theorem 7.

Proof of Theorem 7. We apply Theorem 9 with $X_n = K_n$ and $\mathcal{U}_n = \mathcal{F}_n$. Let

$$J_n(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i M_i\{x\} - \beta}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{x\in S_n} J_n(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i \sum_{x\in S_n} M_i\{x\} - \beta\, L_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i K_i - \beta\, L_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c}$$

and recall the notation

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{F}_n \vee \sigma(R_{n+1}) = \sigma(M_1, \ldots, M_n, R_1, \ldots, R_n, R_{n+1}).$$

Uniform integrability of (K_n^2). It suffices to show that $\sup_n E\big\{e^{t\,K_n}\big\} < \infty$ for some $t > 0$. Let $g(t) = e^t - 1$ and

$$W_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i K_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i}.$$

Arguing as in Lemma 1 and since $\Lambda_n \le D\, n^{\beta-1}$ for some constant D, one obtains

$$E\big\{e^{t\,K_{n+1}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} = e^{g(t)\,\Lambda_n} \prod_{x\in S_n} \big\{1 + g(t)\, J_n(x)\big\} \le \exp\Big\{g(t)\,\Lambda_n + g(t) \sum_{x\in S_n} J_n(x)\Big\}$$
$$\le \exp\Big\{\frac{D\, g(t)}{n^{1-\beta}} + g(t)\, \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i K_i - \beta\, L_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c}\Big\} \le \exp\Big\{\frac{D\, g(t)}{n^{1-\beta}} + g(t)\, W_n\Big\} \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Hence, it is enough to prove that $\sup_n E\big\{e^{t\,W_n}\big\} < \infty$ for some $t > 0$. Define $U_n = \frac{R_{n+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i}$. Since U_n is $\mathcal{G}_n$-measurable,

$$E\big(e^{t\,W_{n+1}}\big) = E\Big\{\exp\Big(t\, W_n\,(1 - U_n)\Big)\, E\big(e^{t\,U_n\,K_{n+1}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big)\Big\}$$
$$\le E\Big\{\exp\Big(\frac{D\, g(t\,U_n)}{n^{1-\beta}}\Big)\, \exp\Big(t\, W_n + \big(g(t\,U_n) - t\,U_n\big)\, W_n\Big)\Big\}.$$

Since $U_n \le b/(n\,u)$ and $W_1 = K_1 \sim \mathrm{Poi}(\alpha)$, it follows that

$$E\big(e^{t\,W_{n+1}}\big) \le a_n(t)\, E\big(e^{b_n(t)\,W_1}\big) < \infty$$

for suitable constants $a_n(t)$ and $b_n(t)$. Thus, $E\big(e^{t\,W_n}\big) < \infty$ for all $n \ge 1$ and $t > 0$. Observe now that $g(z) \le 2\,z$ and $g(z) - z \le z^2$ for $z \in [0,\, 1/2]$. Since $U_n \le b/(n\,u)$, then $t\,U_n \le 1/2$ for $n \ge (2\,b\,t)/u$. Hence, if $t \in (0, 1]$ and $n \ge (2\,b)/u$, then

$$E\big(e^{t\,W_{n+1}}\big) \le \exp\Big\{\frac{2\,D\,(b/u)\,t}{n^{2-\beta}}\Big\}\, E\Big\{\exp\Big(t\,W_n + (t\,U_n)^2 W_n\Big)\Big\} \tag{6}$$
$$\le \exp\Big\{\frac{D^*\,t}{n^{2-\beta}}\Big\}\, E\Big\{\exp\Big(t\,W_n\,(1 + \frac{D^*}{n^2})\Big)\Big\}$$

where $D^* = \max\{2\,D\,(b/u),\,(b/u)^2\}$. Take t and n_0 such that

$$t \in (0,\,1/2], \quad n_0 \geq \frac{2\,b}{u}, \quad \prod_{j\geq n_0}\big(1+\frac{D^*}{j^2}\big) \leq 2.$$

Iterating inequality (6), one finally obtains

$$E\big(e^{t\,W_{n+1}}\big) \leq \exp\Big\{\sum_{j\geq n_0}\frac{2\,D^*\,t}{j^{2-\beta}}\Big\}\,E\big(e^{2\,t\,W_{n_0}}\big) \quad \text{for each } n \geq n_0.$$

This proves the uniform integrability of (K_n^2).

We now turn to condition (j). Since $M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \sim BeP(\nu_n)$,

$$Z_n = E(K_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \nu_n(\mathcal{X}) = \Lambda_n + \sum_{x\in S_n} J_n(x) = \Lambda_n + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i K_i - \beta\,L_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c}.$$

On noting that $L_n = L_{n-1} + N_n$, a simple calculation yields

$$Z_n - Z_{n-1} = \Lambda_n - \Lambda_{n-1} + \frac{R_n(K_n - Z_{n-1}) + R_n\Lambda_{n-1} - \beta N_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i + c}.$$

Condition (j). Since R_{n+1} is independent of $(M_1,\ldots,M_n,M_{n+1},R_1,\ldots,R_n)$,

$$E(K_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = E(K_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = Z_n \quad \text{and} \quad E(N_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = E(N_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \Lambda_n \quad \text{a.s..}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(Z_{n+1} - Z_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big) &= E\big\{E\big(Z_{n+1} - Z_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big) \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big\} \\ &= E\Big\{\Lambda_{n+1} - \Lambda_n + \frac{(R_{n+1} - \beta)\,\Lambda_n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i + c} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\Big\} \quad \text{a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E\big\{\big(E(Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) - Z_n\big)^2\big\} &= E\big\{E\big(Z_{n+1} - Z_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big)^2\big\} \\ &\leq 2\,E\big\{(\Lambda_{n+1} - \Lambda_n)^2\big\} + \frac{2\,(b+1)^2}{u^2}\,\frac{E(\Lambda_n^2)}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, $E\big\{(\Lambda_{n+1} - \Lambda_n)^2\big\} = \mathrm{O}(n^{2\beta-4})$ and $E(\Lambda_n^2) = \mathrm{O}(n^{2\beta-2})$. Hence, condition (j) follows from $\beta < 1/2$ (or equivalently $4 - 2\beta > 3$).

Having proved condition (j) and (K_n^2) uniformly integrable, Theorem 9 yields $Z_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ and $\overline{K}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ for some Z. We next prove $(1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n K_i^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q$ for some Q such that $Q > Z^2$ a.s.. Recall that

$$\sup_n E(K_n^4) \leq \frac{4!}{t^4}\,\sup_n E\big(e^{t\,K_n}\big) < \infty \quad \text{for a suitable } t > 0.$$

Hence, by Lemma 8, $(1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n K_i^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q$ provided $E\big(K_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big) \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q$.

Almost sure convergence of $E\big(K_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big)$ and $Q > Z^2$ a.s.. Letting $G_n = \sum_{x\in S_n} J_n(x)^2$, it is not hard to see that

$$E\big(K_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big) = Z_n + Z_n^2 - G_n \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Thus, since $Z_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Z$ and (G_n) is uniformly integrable, it suffices to prove that (G_n) is a sub-martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_n)$.

Let us define the random variables $\{T_{n,r} : n,\, r \geq 1\}$, with values in $\mathcal{X} \cup \{\infty\}$, as follows. For $n = 1$, let $T_{1,r} = \infty$ for $r > L_1$. If $L_1 > 0$, define $T_{1,1}, \ldots, T_{1,L_1}$ to be the dishes tried by customer 1. By induction, at step $n \geq 2$, let

$$T_{n,r} = T_{n-1,r} \ \text{ for } \ 1 \leq r \leq L_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{n,r} = \infty \ \text{ for } \ r > L_n.$$

If $L_n > L_{n-1}$, define $T_{n,L_{n-1}+1}, \ldots, T_{n,L_n}$ to be the dishes tried for the first time by customer n. Then, $\sigma(T_{n,r}) \subset \mathcal{G}_n$ for all $r \geq 1$. Letting $J_n(\infty) = 0$, one also obtains

$$G_n = \sum_r J_n\big(T_{n,r}\big)^2.$$

For fixed r, since $\sigma(T_{n,r}) \subset \mathcal{G}_n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E\big\{J_{n+1}(T_{n,r}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} &= E\big\{I_{\{r \leq L_n\}}\, J_{n+1}(T_{n,r}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} \\ = I_{\{r \leq L_n\}} &\frac{-\beta + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i M_i\{T_{n,r}\} + R_{n+1} E\big\{M_{n+1}\{T_{n,r}\} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\}}{c + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i} \\ = I_{\{r \leq L_n\}} &\frac{J_n(T_{n,r})\,\{c + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i\} + R_{n+1} J_n(T_{n,r})}{c + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i} = J_n(T_{n,r}) \quad \text{a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$E\big\{G_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} = E\Big\{\sum_r J_{n+1}(T_{n+1,r})^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n\Big\} \geq E\Big\{\sum_r J_{n+1}(T_{n,r})^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n\Big\}$$

$$= \sum_r E\big\{J_{n+1}(T_{n,r})^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\} \geq \sum_r E\big\{J_{n+1}(T_{n,r}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n\big\}^2 = \sum_r J_n(T_{n,r})^2 = G_n \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Therefore, (G_n) is a $(\mathcal{G}_n)$-sub-martingale, as required.

From now on, Q denotes a real random variable satisfying

$$E\big(K_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n\big) \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K_i^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q.$$

Let us prove $Q > Z^2$ a.s.. Let $Y_n = J_n(T_{n,1})$. Since (Y_n) is a $[0,1]$-valued sub-martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_n)$, one obtains $Y_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} Y$ for some random variable Y. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} Q - Z^2 &= \lim_n \big\{E(K_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n) - Z_n^2\big\} = \lim_n \big\{Z_n - G_n\big\} \\ &= \lim_n \Big\{\Lambda_n + \sum_r J_n(T_{n,r})\,\big(1 - J_n(T_{n,r})\big)\Big\} \\ &\geq \lim_n Y_n\,(1 - Y_n) = Y\,(1 - Y) \quad \text{a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

Since $L_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ (because of Theorem 4) then $T_{n,1} \neq \infty$ eventually a.s.. Hence, arguing as in [2] and [17] (see also Subsection 4.3 of [6]) it can be shown that Y has a diffuse distribution. Therefore, $0 < Y < 1$ and $Q - Z^2 \geq Y\,(1 - Y) > 0$ a.s..

We finally turn to conditions (jj)-(jjj)-(jv).

Condition (jj). Since $E(Z_{n-1}^4) = E\big\{E(K_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1})^4\big\} \leq E(K_n^4)$, then

$$\sup_n E\big\{K_n^4 + Z_{n-1}^4 + \Lambda_{n-1}^4 + N_n^4\big\} \leq 2\,\sup_n E\big\{K_n^4 + \Lambda_{n-1}^4 + N_n^4\big\} < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$E\Big\{\Big(\sup_{n\geq 1}\sqrt{n}\,\big|Z_n-Z_{n-1}\big|\Big)^4\Big\}\leq\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^2E\big\{(Z_n-Z_{n-1})^4\big\}$$

$$\leq D_1\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^2\Big\{E\big\{\big(\Lambda_n-\Lambda_{n-1}\big)^4\big\}+\frac{E\big\{K_n^4+Z_{n-1}^4+\Lambda_{n-1}^4+N_n^4\big\}}{n^4}\Big\}$$

$$\leq D_2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Big\{\frac{1}{n^{6-4\beta}}+\frac{1}{n^2}\Big\}<\infty$$

where D_1 and D_2 are suitable constants.

In order to prove (jjj)-(jv), we let

$$U=\frac{q-r^2}{r^2}\,(Q-Z^2)\quad\text{and}\quad V=\frac{q}{r^2}\,(Q-Z^2).$$

Condition (jjj). Let $X_n=\big\{K_n-Z_{n-1}+n(Z_{n-1}-Z_n)\big\}^2$. On noting that $\sum_n n^2E\big\{(Z_n-Z_{n-1})^4\big\}<\infty$, as shown in (jj), one obtains $\sum_n n^{-2}E(X_n^2)<\infty$. Thus, by Lemma 8, it suffices to prove $E\big(X_n\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big)\xrightarrow{a.s.}U$. To this end, we first note that

$$E\big\{(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}=E\big\{K_n^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}-Z_{n-1}^2\xrightarrow{a.s.}Q-Z^2.$$

We next prove

$$(*)\ n^2E\Big\{\frac{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{\big(\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c\big)^2}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}V;$$

$$(**)\ n\,E\Big\{\frac{R_n(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}Q-Z^2.$$

In fact,

$$n^2E\Big\{\frac{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c)^2}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\leq n^2\frac{E\big\{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}}{\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}R_i\big)^2}$$

$$=\big(\frac{n}{n-1}\big)^2\,\frac{E(R_n^2)\,E\big\{(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}}{\big(\overline{R}_{n-1}\big)^2}\xrightarrow{a.s.}\frac{q\,(Q-Z^2)}{r^2}=V.$$

Similarly, since $R_n\leq b$,

$$n^2E\Big\{\frac{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c)^2}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\geq n^2\frac{E\big\{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}}{\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}R_i+b+c\big)^2}\xrightarrow{a.s.}V.$$

This proves condition (*) while (**) can be shown by exactly the same argument. Finally, it is not hard to see that

$$n^2E\big\{(Z_{n-1}-Z_n)^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}-n^2E\Big\{\frac{R_n^2(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c)^2}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}0,$$

$$n\,E\big\{(K_n-Z_{n-1})\,(Z_{n-1}-Z_n)\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}+n\,E\Big\{\frac{R_n(K_n-Z_{n-1})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^nR_i+c}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\Big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}0.$$

Therefore, $n^2E\big\{(Z_{n-1}-Z_n)^2\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}V$ and

$$2\,n\,E\big\{(K_n-Z_{n-1})\,(Z_{n-1}-Z_n)\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\}\xrightarrow{a.s.}-2\,(Q-Z^2),$$

which in turn implies $E\big(X_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big) \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} V - (Q - Z^2) = U$.

Condition (jv). Let $X_n = n^2(Z_n - Z_{n-1})^2$. Since $\sum_n n^2 E\big\{(Z_n - Z_{n-1})^4\big\} < \infty$ and $n^2 E\big\{(Z_{n-1} - Z_n)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\big\} \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} V$, as shown in (jj) and (jjj), Lemma 8 yields

$$n \sum_{k \geq n} (Z_{k-1} - Z_k)^2 = n \sum_{k \geq n} \frac{X_k}{k^2} \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} V.$$

In view of Theorem 9, this concludes the proof.

□

Acknowledgments. Irene Crimaldi was partially supported by CNR PNR project "CRISIS Lab" for this paper.

References

[1] Abramowits M., Stegun I.A. (1972) Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graph, and mathematical tables, *U.S. Department of Commerce.*

[2] Aletti G., May C., Secchi P. (2009) A central limit theorem, and related results, for a two-color randomly reinforced urn, *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 41, 829-844.

[3] Bassetti F., Crimaldi I., Leisen F. (2010) Conditionally identically distributed species sampling sequences, *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 42, 433-459.

[4] Berti P., Pratelli L., Rigo P. (2004) Limit theorems for a class of identically distributed random variables, *Ann. Probab.* 32, 2029-2052.

[5] Berti P., Crimaldi I., Pratelli L., Rigo P. (2009) Rate of convergence of predictive distributions for dependent data, *Bernoulli* 15, 1351-1367.

[6] Berti P., Crimaldi I., Pratelli L., Rigo P. (2011) A central limit thorem and its applications to multicolor randomly reinforced urns, *J. Appl. Probab.* 48, 527-546.

[7] Broderick T., Jordan M.I., Pitman J. (2012) Beta Processes, Stick-Breaking and Power Laws, *Bayesian Analysis* 7, 439-476.

[8] Cinlar E. (2011) *Probability and Stochastics*, Springer.

[9] Crimaldi I., Letta G., Pratelli L. (2007) A strong form of stable convergence, *Seminaire de Probabilites* XL, Lect. Notes in Math., 1899, 203-225.

[10] Doshi-Velez F., Ghahramani Z. (2009) Correlated non-parametric latent feature models, In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence* 25, 143-150, AUAI press.

[11] Gershman S.J., Frazier P.I., Blei D.M. (2012) Distance dependent infinite latent feature models, arXiv:1110.5454v2 [stat.ML] 10 Sep 2012.

[12] Gorur D., Jakel F., Rasmussen C.E. (2006) A choice model with infinitely many latent features, In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 23, 361-368, Omni press.

[13] Griffiths T.L., Ghahramani Z. (2006) Infinite latent feature models and the indian buffet process, In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 18, 475-482, MIT Press.

[14] Griffiths T.L., Ghahramani Z. (2011) The Indian Buffet Process: An Introduction and Review, *J. Machine Lear. Res.* 12, 1185-1224.

[15] Hall P., Heyde C.C. (1980) *Martingale limit theory and its application*, Academic press, New York.

[16] Knowles D., Ghahramani Z. (2011) Nonparametric Bayesian sparse factor models with application to gene expression modeling, *Ann. Appl. Statist.* 5, 1534-1552.

[17] May C., Flournoy N. (2009) Asymptotics in response-adaptive designs generated by a two-color, randomly reinforced urn, *Ann. Statist.* 37, 1058-1078.

[18] Meeds E., Ghahramani Z., Neal R.M., Roweis S.T. (2007) Modeling dyadic data with binary latent factors, In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 19, 977-984, MIT press.

[19] Miller K.T., Griffiths T.L., Jordan M.I. (2008) The phylogenetic Indian buffet process: a non-exchangeable nonparametric prior for latent features, In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence* 24, 403-410, AUAI press.

[20] Navarro D.J., Griffiths T.L. (2008) Latent features in similarity judgment: A nonparametric Bayesian approach, *Neural Computation* 20 (11), 2597-2628.

[21] Pemantle R. (2007) A survey of random processes with reinforcement, *Probab. Surveys* 4, 1-79.

[22] Teh Y.W., Gorur D. (2009) Indian Buffet Processes with Power-law Behaviour, In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 22, 1838-1846, Mit press.

[23] Thibaux R., Jordan M.I. (2007) Hierarchical Beta Processes and the Indian Buffet Process, In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* 11, 564-571, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

[24] Williamson S., Orbanz P., Ghahramani Z. (2010) Dependent Indian buffet processes, In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* 9, 924-931.

[25] Wood F., Griffiths T.L., Ghahramani Z. (2006) A non-parametric Bayesian method for inferring hidden causes, In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence* 22, 536-543, AUAI press.

Patrizia Berti, Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata "G. Vitali", Universita' di Modena e Reggio-Emilia, via Campi 213/B, 41100 Modena, Italy
E-mail address: `patrizia.berti@unimore.it`

Irene Crimaldi, IMT Institute for Advanced Studies, Piazza San Ponziano 6, 55100 Lucca, Italy
E-mail address: `irene.crimaldi@imtlucca.it`

Luca Pratelli, Accademia Navale, viale Italia 72, 57100 Livorno, Italy
E-mail address: `pratel@mail.dm.unipi.it`

Pietro Rigo, Dipartimento di Matematica "F. Casorati", Universita' di Pavia, via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy
E-mail address: `pietro.rigo@unipv.it`